



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,881	04/25/2001	Jae Kyung Lee	P-219	4938
34610	7590	08/08/2007	EXAMINER	
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP			BELIVEAU, SCOTT E	
P.O. Box 221200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200			2623	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

AUG 08 2007

Technology Center 2600

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/840,881

Filing Date: April 25, 2001

Appellant(s): LEE ET AL.

Mr. David Oren
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 24 May 2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 07 July 2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,202,212	STURGEON et al.	03-2001
2004/0024657	WRIGHT et al.	02-2004

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

1. Claims 1-10, 12, 13, 15-18, and 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sturgeon et al. (US Pat No. 6,202,212 B1) in view of Wright et al. (US Pub No. 2004/0024657 A1).

In consideration of claim 1, the Sturgeon et al. reference discloses an "apparatus" or species of "TV" [82]. The "apparatus" or "TV" [82] is operable to "reproduce video and audio signals by receiving a broadcast signal" and comprises a "storing unit" ([104] or [106] or [114] or [116] or [112]) and a "controlling unit" [102] that "accesses information from [an] Internet site" (Col 5, Line 59 – Col 6, Line 25). The "control unit . . . in response to a user pressing a function selection key" is operable to "display function information and feature information of the TV on a screen" [40] in association with the presentation of on-line user guide for using the system (Col 11, Lines 60-67; Col 12, Lines 10-12). The reference, however, does not explicitly disclose "storing proper information of the TV and contact information of an Internet site . . . prior to the user

pressing the function selection key" in association with accessing the disclosed on-line user guide.

In an analogous art related to the similar problem of obtaining function and feature information, the Wright et al. reference discloses a "storage unit" [200] "for storing proper information . . . and contact information of an Internet site" (Para. [0023] and [0025] – [0027]) and a "controlling unit" [202] "to access information from the Internet site using the stored proper information . . . the proper information of the [product] and the contact information having been [necessarily] stored in the storing unit prior to the user" requesting the information (Para. [0030]). The "controlling unit" [202] subsequently "displays function information and feature information of the [product] by using the stored contact information and the stored proper information" (Figure 4). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the Sturgeon et al. "TV" [82] to comprise a "storing unit for storing proper information of the TV and contact information of an Internet site; and a controlling unit to access information from the Internet site using the stored proper information of the TV in response to a user pressing a function selection key, the proper information of the TV and the contact information having been stored in the storing unit prior to the user pressing the function selection key, the controlling unit further displaying function information and feature information of the TV on a screen by using the stored contact information and the stored proper information" for the purpose of providing a satisfactory manner to provide easily updatable product information for the life of the product (Wright et al.: Para. [0007]).

Claim 2 is rejected wherein the “Internet site is a product-related site” in so far as it comprises product specific information (Wright et al.: Para. [0045]).

Claim 3 is rejected wherein the “function information and feature information of the TV is provided from a product-related site server” associated with the manufacturer/supplier of the product (Wright et al.: Para. [0045]).

Claim 4 is rejected in light of the combined references wherein the “controller unit transmits the proper information of the TV to a product-related site server in response to the pressing of the function selection key” (Wright et al.: Para. [0023], [0025], and [0026]).

Claim 5 is rejected in light of the combined references wherein the “proper information of the TV is provided to a product-related site server in response to the pressing of the function selection key” through a “network interface” [152] as provided by Sturgeon et al.

Claim 6 is rejected wherein the “proper information of the product is a model name or model number” (Wright et al.: Para. [0023]).

Claim 7 is rejected wherein the “contact information is a URL (Uniform Resource Locator)” (Wright et al.: Para. [0027]).

In consideration of claim 8, the “function information” is “information corresponding to video or audio-related functions” associated with the operation of the system (Sturgeon et al.: Col 12, Lines 10-12). For example, “video or audio related functions” might relate to the switching between TV and PC modes.

In consideration of claim 9, as aforementioned, the Sturgeon et al. reference discloses that the user is provided with on-line user guide. Applicant's admission of fact provides evidence that it is notoriously well known in the art for user manuals to comprise information detailing "special functions" associated with the particular device. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to provide information in the user guide detailing "special functions of the TV" for the purpose advantageously explaining to the user the operation and functionality of the interconnected device.

In consideration of claim 10, as aforementioned, the Sturgeon et al. reference discloses a "control method of a TV" [82] that facilitates a plurality of functional modes including modes that facilitate Internet access. The reference discloses that "when a key selection is made by a user", the system is operable to display an on-line user guide for using the system (Col 11, Lines 60-67; Col 12, Lines 10-12). In conjunction with accessing on-line help, the reference does not explicitly disclose "transmitting stored proper information of the TV from the TV to a product-related site by using stored contact information of the product-related site stored in the TV in advance of the key selection by the user, wherein the proper information includes a model name or model number of the TV". Furthermore, the reference is unclear as to the nature of the on-line help so as to include the particular display of "menu information" as claimed.

In an analogous art related to the similar problem of obtaining function and feature information, the Wright et al. reference discloses a "transmitting stored proper information of [a product] from the [product] to a product-related site by using stored

contact information of the product-related site stored in the [product] in advance of" any user request for such information wherein the "proper information includes a model name or a model number of the product" (Para. [0023], [0025] – [0027], and [0030]). The method subsequently entails "receiving menu information corresponding to the [product]", "receiving information selected by the user in the menu information; and displaying the selected information" (Figure 4; Para [0031] – [0036]). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the Sturgeon et al. reference such that "when a key selection is made by a user, transmitting stored proper information of the TV from the TV to a product-related site by using stored contact information of the product-related site stored in the TV in advance of the key selection by the user, wherein the proper information includes a model name or model number of the TV' receiving menu information corresponding to the TV; receiving information selected by the user in the menu information; and displaying the selected information on a screen of the TV" for the purpose of providing a satisfactory manner to provide easily updatable product information for the life (Wright et al.: Para. [0007]).

Claim 12 is rejected wherein the "proper information is transmitted by using the contact information of the product-related site" (Wright et al.: Para. [0023], [0025], [0026]).

Claim 13 is rejected wherein the "contact information is a URL (Uniform Resource Locator)" (Wright et al.: Para. [0027]).

Claim 15 is rejected in light of the combined references. As aforementioned, the Sturgeon et al. reference discloses that the user may retrieve on-line help so as to

facilitate the user in using the system which would include “information corresponding to video or audio-related functions of the TV” (Sturgeon et al.: Col 12, Lines 10-12). For example, “video or audio related functions” might relate to the switching between TV and PC mode. The reference is unclear as to “information corresponding to a special function of the TV”. Applicant’s admission of fact provides evidence that it is notoriously well known in the art for user manuals to further comprise information detailing “special functions” associated with the particular device. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify the combined teachings such that “the menu information is information corresponding to video or audio-related functions of the TV, and information corresponding to a special function of the TV” for the purpose advantageously explaining to the user the operation and functionality of the interconnected device.

Claim 16 is rejected in light of the aforementioned combination of references wherein the “transmitting the stored proper information occurs when a function selection key signal is inputted by the user” so as to active the on-line user guide functionality (Sturgeon et al.: Col 11, Lines 60-67).

Claim 17 is rejected wherein the “control method further comprises receiving and processing a broadcast signal when the function selection key signal is not inputted” such that the user may simply operate the device to watch television (Sturgeon et al.: Col 10, Lines 8-13).

In consideration of claim 18, the Sturgeon et al. reference discloses that the “TV” [82] further supports features associated with a computing device that includes the ability to

access the Internet (Col 6, Lines 1-14) and perform features associated with such including the browsing and retrieval of web-web pages (Col 1, Lines 32-48; Col 2, Lines 6-17). Accordingly, the reference meets the limitation wherein the "control method further comprises displaying general homepage information on the screen after receiving it when the proper information of the TV is not transmitted to the product-related site" in association with the retrieval and browsing of other web pages besides those corresponding to the product.

Claim 20 is rejected as previously set forth. The Sturgeon et al. reference discloses a "television system" [82] that is operable to access the Internet, to "receive a key signal indicating a desire to obtain product-related information" associated with product related help and to "display . . . received information [on] a screen of the television system". While the reference suggests the particular usage of an on-line help manual, the reference does not explicitly disclose nor preclude the particular usage scenarios as claimed.

In an analogous art related to the similar problem of obtaining function and feature information, the Wright et al. reference discloses a "transmitting previously-stored identifying information of [a product] to a server in direct response to the" user request for information wherein the "identifying information having been stored in the [product] prior to receiving the key signal" (Para. [0023], [0025] – [0027], and [0030]). The method subsequently entails "receiving information at the [product] and from the server based on the transmitted previously-stored identifying information; and displaying the received information" (Figure 4; Para [0031] – [0036]). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the Sturgeon et al. reference so

as to "transmit previously-stored identifying information of a television system to a server in direct response to the received key signal, the identifying information having been stored in the television system prior to receiving the key signal; receiving information at the television system and from the server based on the transmitted previously-stored identifying information; and displaying the received information on a screen of the television system" for the purpose of providing a satisfactory manner to provide easily updatable product information for the life (Wright et al.: Para. [0007]).

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected in light of the combined teachings wherein the "previously-stored identifying information comprises a model name of the television system stored in the television system prior to receiving the key signal" or a "model number of the television system stored prior to receiving the signal stored in the television system prior to receiving the key signal" (Wright et al.: Para. [0023]).

Claim 23 is rejected wherein the "transmitting previously-stored identifying information of the television system comprises transmitting the previously-stored identifying information based on previously-stored contact information of a website" (Wright et al.: Para. [0033]).

Claim 24 is rejected wherein the "contact information is a URL (Uniform Resource Locator)" (Wright et al.: Para. [0027]).

Claim 25 is rejected wherein the method further comprises "receiving menu information from the website in response to the transmitted previously-stored identifying information of the television system" (Wright et al.: Figure 4).

Claim 26 is rejected in light of the combined references. As aforementioned, the Sturgeon et al. reference discloses that the user may retrieve on-line help to help using the system which would include “information corresponding to video or audio-related functions of the TV” (Sturgeon et al.: Col 12, Lines 10-12). For example, “video or audio related functions” might relate to the switching between TV and PC mode. The reference is unclear as to “information corresponding to a special function of the TV”. Applicant’s admission of fact provides evidence that it is notoriously well known in the art for user manuals to further comprise information detailing “special functions” associated with the particular device. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify the combined teachings such that “the menu information comprises information corresponding to video or audio-related functions of the TV, and information corresponding to a special function of the TV” for the purpose advantageously explaining to the user the operation and functionality of the interconnected device.

(10) Response to Argument

The examiner respectfully disagrees that the rejection should be reversed. The Examiner’s Answer only addresses arguments for patentability made appellant.¹ Any further arguments regarding other elements or limitations not specifically argued that the appellant could have made are considered by the examiner as having been conceded by the appellant for the basis of the decision of this appeal. Accordingly, these further arguments are not

Art Unit: 2623

being addressed further for consideration by the panel. Should the panel find that the examiner's position/arguments or any aspect of the rejection is not sufficiently clear or a particular issue is of need of further explanation, it is respectfully requested that the case be remanded to the examiner for further explanation prior to the rendering of a decision.²

Independent Claim 1

Regarding claim 1, Appellants assert that the examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the prior art combination of Sturgeon and Write, either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest a controlling unit to access information from an Internet site using stored proper information of a TV in response to a user pressing a function selection key as claimed. In support of their position, appellants argue against the references in a piecemeal manner. However, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.³ Accordingly, the examiner respectfully disagrees a *prima facie* case of obvious has not been established because the references in combination provide a logical combination that suggests all of the claimed limitations.

As described in the Final rejection, the Sturgeon reference discloses a particular species of television namely a 'PC/TV' [82] as illustrated in Figure 1B. The instant application does not preclude the claimed 'TV' cannot be a 'PC/TV'. Figure 2 illustrates that the TV comprises a 'storing unit' ([104] or [106] or [114] or [116] or [112]) and a 'controlling unit'

¹ Per 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii) – a statement which merely points out what a claim recites will not be considered an argument for patentability of the claim.

² See 37 CFR 41.50(a)(1) and MPEP 1211.

[102] that ‘accesses information from the Internet’ (Col 5, Line 59 – Col 6, Line 25). The reference further explicitly teaches that the device “in response to a user pressing a function selection key” on the remote control [124] (Col 11, Lines 60-65) accesses a ‘Help’ function that ‘calls up the PC Theatre Online User’s Guide, which provides the user with help using the system’ (Col 12, Lines 10-12). In response to appellant’s argument that a special definition (Page 8, Para. 2), the application is not limiting with respect to the nature of the ‘function selection key’ going so far as to state that the element is “not shown” (IA: Page 7, Line 24 – Page 8, Line 4). To summarize, Sturgeon teaches the existence of a television that is capable of accessing the Internet and is further capable of accessing/displaying a ‘TV’ online user guide in response to a user selecting to access that function. Sturgeon, however, is silent with respect to known details relating to how an online user guide (such as one associated with a TV) is retrieved and processed by an Internet enabled device.

Wright teaches that it is desirable to provide a means for a customer to retrieve and display product information from the Internet (Para. [0007]). Wright subsequently provides evidence that it is known for a consumer product to store both ‘proper information’ and ‘contact information’ and to use that information to retrieve and to display ‘function’ and ‘feature’ information for the specific product (Figure 3B and 4). As noted by appellant, the only difference between the disclosure of Wright and the claim relates to the intended use of the teachings of Wright. Namely, Wright does not explicitly disclose that the customer product is specifically a ‘TV’. Appellants subsequently conclude that Wright’s disclosure simply cannot be applied to any product including a ‘TV’ as claimed. However, the

³ See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375

Art Unit: 2623

arguments of counsel cannot take the place of evidence in the record.⁴ Appellants have provided no evidence to support that the teachings of Wright could not be employed to provide access to online documentation for a whole host of specific products including a ‘TV’. Rather, it would appear that one would have been motivated use the teachings of Wright to any known device that physically included at least the components of Figure 2 and for which product information was available (Para. [0025] – [0027]).

Sturgeon provides evidence that online customer product information for a ‘TV’ is known. All of the components of Figure 2 of Wright are found in the Sturgeon system. It is the examiner’s opinion that one having ordinary skill in the art, when looking to a solution with respect to how to provide the ‘online user guide’ of Sturgeon, would have looked to references that detailed how consumer products solved the problems associated accessing product information. Along those lines, the examiner concluded that one skilled in the art, absent any disclosure to the contrary, would recognize that the teachings of Wright provide a solution as to how to access online consumer information for a wide range of known internet-enabled consumer electronic devices. It is the examiner’s opinion that a modification to retrieve/access the online TV user’s guide of Sturgeon using both the stored ‘proper information’ and ‘contact information’ as described by Wright would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made. Therefore, taken in combination, all of the claimed limitations are believed met.

(Fed. Cir. 1986).

⁴ In re Schulze, 346 F.2d 600, 602, 145 USPQ 716, 718 (CCPA 1965); In re Geisler, 116 F.3d 1465, 43 USPQ2d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (“An assertion of what seems to follow from common experience is just attorney argument and not the kind of factual evidence that is required to rebut a prima facie case of obviousness.”)

Dependent Claim 2

Appellants argue that claim 2 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. As aforementioned, Sturgeon discloses an Internet capable ‘TV’ that accesses an ‘online user guide’ through a ‘network interface’. Wright teaches accessing information from an Internet site using stored proper information of the specific product. Accordingly, claim 2 is not believed patentable in light of the combined teachings as set forth in the Final rejection and preceding response to the appellant’s arguments.

Dependent Claim 3

Appellants argue that claim 3 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. No particular arguments regarding these additional features are provided other than what the claim recites. Accordingly, claim 2 is not believed to be allowable as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding responses to the appellant’s arguments.

Dependent Claim 4

Appellants argue that claim 4 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. As aforementioned, Sturgeon discloses an Internet capable ‘TV’ that accesses an ‘online user guide’ and comprises a ‘network interface’ [152]. This information is accessed in response to ‘pressing a function selection key’ (Col 11, Lines 60-66). Wright provides detailed information that online information is retrieved once the

'controlling unit transmits the proper information . . . to a product-related site server'.

Accordingly, claim 4 is not believed patentable in light of the combined teachings whereupon the particular process of retrieving/accessing an online user guide is initiated based on the key-press of Sturgeon as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding responses to the appellant's arguments.

Dependent Claim 5

Appellants argue that claim 5 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. No further arguments regarding these additional features are provided other than what the claim recites and those previously addressed. Accordingly, claim 5 is not believed to be allowable as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the appellant's arguments.

Dependent Claim 6

Appellants argue that claim 6 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. As aforementioned, Sturgeon discloses a particular model of an Internet capable 'TV' that accesses an 'online user guide'. Wright teaches that the label [100] includes 'contact information' [102] such as a URL and other information or 'proper information' [104] comprising a 'model name' and serial number or 'model number' (Para. [0020] and [0023]). The reference later states that the label [100] is used to display the appropriate web page (Para. [0025] and [0030]). It is respectfully noted that it does not state in these sections that the indicator [102] as opposed to the generic label [100] is used to

Art Unit: 2623

access the web site. While a unique product URL is contemplated by the reference in one arrangement, the examiner concludes that the teachings also contemplate facilitated the more generic usage of the label to provide for a single portal site or location (Para. [0007]) that provides for different specific pages of information depending upon the associated make/model information provided by the label. Therefore, since the label [100] is used to access the web site, Wright utilizes both the ‘contact information’ or URL and the ‘proper information’ in the form of the ‘model name’ or ‘model number’ to retrieve product specific information. Accordingly, claim 6 is not believed patentable in light of the combined teachings whereupon the particular process of retrieving/accessing a product specific online user guide is initiated by Sturgeon as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding responses to the appellant’s arguments.

Dependent Claim 7

Appellants argue that claim 7 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. No further arguments regarding these additional features are provided other than what the claim recites and those previously addressed. Accordingly, claim 7 is not believed to be allowable over the combination of references as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the appellant’s arguments.

Dependent Claim 8

Appellants argue that claim 8 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. Sturgeon is a type of ‘TV’ that includes ‘video or audio-

Art Unit: 2623

related features' including features related to TV specific items such as switching between TV mode and other modes, using the electronic program guide, or choosing the source of the television signal (Col 12, Lines 10-23). The 'Help' menu facilitates the usage of these 'TV' functions. Accordingly, claim 8 is not believed to be allowable over the combination of references as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the appellant's arguments.

Dependent Claim 9

Appellants argue that claim 9 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. In particular, appellants assert that they have not admitted that it is well known for 'user manuals (of a PC theater) to include information corresponding to a special function of a TV'. It is respectfully noted that neither the claim nor the originally presented OFFICIAL NOTICE recited a user manual of a 'PC theatre' per se. Following the guidance provided in MPEP 2144.03, OFFICIAL NOTICE was taken in the first office action (Non-Final rejection, mailed 14 January 2005) as to the fact that it was well known for user manuals to comprise information detailing special functions of the particular device. Appellant made no reference to the fact noted and therefore did not adequately challenge the fact in their subsequent response. It was noted in the subsequent action (Final rejection, mailed 30 June 2005) that the fact noted had been taken as an admission. Accordingly, appellant's assertion regarding the missing features of claim 9 with respect to the claimed should not be deemed persuasive as the remarks have not been seasonably presented and the claims do not specifically require a user manual of a PC theater per se.

Assuming arguendo that evidence over and above appellant's admission of fact need be provided in order to support the rejection, it is respectfully noted for the Panel's review that the document entitled "Compaq.com – AtHome Service & Support" (mailed 24 January 2006) provides evidence that online user guides that outline special functions of the TV were known in the art (Ability to upgrade processor/memory, Page 1, Virus checking – Page 2, HomeNetworking – Page 4, etc.). Further evidence to support the noted fact can be provided should the Panel feel that such is necessary. Accordingly, claim 9 is not believed to be allowable over the combination of references as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the appellant's arguments.

Independent Claim 10

Appellants argue that claim 10 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. These previous features were addressed in association with claim 6. Accordingly, claim 10 is not believed to be allowable over the combination of references as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the appellant's arguments.

Dependent Claim 12

Appellants argue that claim 12 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. As previously noted, the combination of references relies upon the online retrieval of information for a 'TV'. Accordingly, claim 12 is not believed to

be allowable over the combination of references as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the appellant's arguments.

Dependent Claim 13

Appellants argue that claim 13 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. No particular arguments regarding these additional features are provided other than what the claim recites. Accordingly, claim 13 is not believed to be allowable over the combination of references as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the appellant's arguments.

Dependent Claim 15

Appellants argue that claim 15 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. No further arguments regarding these additional features are provided other than what the claim recites and arguments previously presented. Accordingly, claim 15 is not believed to be allowable over the combination of references as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the appellant's arguments.

Dependent Claim 16

Appellants argue that claim 16 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. No further arguments regarding these additional features are provided other than what the claim recites and arguments previously presented. Accordingly, claim 16 is not believed patentable in light of the combined teachings whereupon the

particular process of retrieving/accessing an online user guide is initiated based on the key-
press of Sturgeon as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the
appellant's arguments.

Dependent Claim 17

Appellants argue that claim 17 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. No particular arguments regarding these additional features are provided other than what the claim recites. Accordingly, claim 17 is not believed to be allowable over the combination of references as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the appellant's arguments.

Dependent Claim 18

Appellants argue that claim 18 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. No particular arguments regarding these additional features are provided other than what the claim recites. Accordingly, claim 18 is not believed to be allowable over the combination of references as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the appellant's arguments.

Independent Claim 20

Over and above previously noted arguments, appellants assert that the combination fails to teach or suggest transmitting previously stored identifying information of a television

system to a server in direct response to the received key signal. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

As aforementioned, Sturgeon discloses an Internet capable ‘TV’ that accesses an ‘online user guide’ and comprises a ‘network interface’ [152]. The specification, as originally filled, does recite the phrase in ‘direct response’ ad verbatim. It was subsequently construed as a causal relationship (i.e. responsive to hitting the selection key, the product information is requested). The examiner relied upon Sturgeon to teach the claimed ‘key signal’ whereupon the online user guide is requested/retrieved ‘in direct response to the received key signal’ (Col 11, Lines 60-66; Col 12, Lines 10-12) resulting in calling up the online user guide.

Wright teaches that the user ‘retrieves the web site information’ (Para. [0024]). The examiner construed this passage, in light of the remainder of the reference, to imply that the user somehow initiated or requested for product information to be provided and that the information was responsively or ‘directly’ provided as illustrated in Figure 3A. Accordingly, claim 20 is not believed patentable in light of the combined teachings whereupon the particular process of retrieving/accessing a ‘TV’ online user guide is initiated based on the key-press of Sturgeon as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the appellant’s arguments.

Dependent Claim 21

Appellants argue that claim 21 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. No particular arguments regarding these additional features are provided other than what the claim recites. Accordingly, claim 21 is not believed to be

Art Unit: 2623

allowable over the combination of references as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the appellant's arguments.

Dependent Claim 22

Appellants argue that claim 22 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. No further arguments regarding these additional features are provided other than what the claim recites and those arguments previously presented. Accordingly, claim 22 is not believed to be allowable over the combination of references as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the appellant's arguments.

Dependent Claim 23

Appellants argue that claim 23 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. No further arguments regarding these additional features are provided other than what the claim recites and those arguments previously presented. Accordingly, claim 23 is not believed to be allowable over the combination of references as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the appellant's arguments.

Dependent Claim 24

Appellants argue that claim 24 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. No particular arguments regarding these additional features are provided other than what the claim recites. Accordingly, claim 24 is not believed to be

Art Unit: 2623

allowable over the combination of references as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the appellant's arguments.

Dependent Claim 25

Appellants argue that claim 25 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. No further arguments regarding these additional features are provided other than what the claim recites and those arguments previously presented. As previously noted, the combined teachings relate to a 'television system'. Accordingly, claim 25 is not believed to be allowable over the combination of references as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the appellant's arguments.

Dependent Claim 26

Appellants argue that claim 26 is allowable for being dependent upon an allowable claim and reciting additional features. No further arguments regarding these additional features are provided other than what the claim recites and those arguments previously presented. Accordingly, claim 26 is not believed to be allowable over the combination of references as set forth in the Final rejection and the preceding response to the appellant's arguments.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

SEB

July 24, 2007

Conferees:

Scott Beliveau

SEB
SCOTT E. BELIVEAU
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER

Andrew Koenig

AK
ANDREW Y. KOENIG
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
ACTING SPE

Christopher Grant

CG
CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600